

view, however, of the considerable variations in colour in this genus, and the alteration of characters due to age, I am not at present prepared to admit more than a single species as occurring in the Saruwaged Mountains. One of the adults, No. 4, has its fur profusely mixed with greyish white anteriorly, while No. 12 has no grey at all, and the general colour is far more rufous. Much more material is needed before any sound opinion on the number of species can be arrived at.

LXXXIII. — *The Generic Name of the Finless-backed Porpoise, formerly known as Neomeris phocænoides.* By  
 OLDFIELD THOMAS.

(Published by permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.)

THE question of the proper treatment of misprints in generic names is one that bristles with difficulties, and needs most careful consideration in every case. Sometimes, when the misprinted name has been used in a perfectly valid form, it would seem that we ought to recognize it as having full status, in spite of its being obviously or presumably a misprint. This was the course I followed in renaming the *Dryomys* of 1906, because of the accidental use of that name (as a misprint for *Drymomys*) by Philippi six years before, and it has received the approval of later writers. When, however, the misprint is not, viewed simply by itself, strictly valid, for want of diagnosis or identifiable type-species, the name should be considered as having no status at all. This would, for instance, apply to Wallace's *Neotomys* of 1876, which antedates, but does not invalidate, my *Neotomys* of 1894.

Now, this question of misprints arises in the case of the Porpoise to which Gray applied the generic name of *Neomeris*, for that word proved to be invalid owing to its having been used earlier for an invertebrate, and in dealing with it Palmer, when preparing his great work on nomenclature, replaced it by *Neophocæna*, after quoting two other names which he set aside as misprints. His notice of *Neomeris*, abbreviated, is as follows (exact references are given in his 'Index Generum Mammalium,' p. 453, 1904):—

*Neomeris*, Gray, 1846, *nec* Lamouroux, 1816.

*Meomeris*, Gray, 1847.

*Nomeris*, Coues, 1890, and, finally,

*Neophocæna*, Palmer, 1899.

Taking *Nomeris* first, as being the clearest case, I confess I see no way of putting it aside. Even its being a misprint is purely an assumption, while the sentence in which it is founded is perfectly properly worded, with a genotype (*Phocæna melus*, misprint for *Ph. melas*, a recognized synonym of *Ph. phocænoides*) and a couple of words of diagnosis, so that there can be no doubt whatever as to what animal it applies to, or as to the technical validity of its foundation. It should, therefore, be recognised as a name having technical status, and, being earlier than *Neophocæna*, would naturally invalidate that. We may believe *Nomeris* was a misprint, but there is no evidence to that effect, and, even if it had been said to be so by its author, that would not remove its technical validity.

But there is an earlier name, *Meomeris*. In Gray's 'List of the Osteological Specimens in the British Museum,' 1847, this name appears in the Systematic Index on p. xii, in its proper place next to *Phocæna*, with the species-name *phocænoides*, and there being only one *phocænoides* in the family Delphinidæ, it is clear what is the genotype of *Meomeris*. In the body of the work (p. 36) we have "The Finless Porpoise, *Meomeris phocænoides*," placed as the only species of the genus *Neomeris*. It may, therefore, be assumed that *Meomeris* is a misprint for the earlier name *Neomeris*, but none the less it is put in too valid a way to be ignored, having both type-species and a descriptive word. I therefore maintain, on the lines used in dealing with *Dryomys*, that *Meomeris* should be considered as having full technical status, and that, instead of the much later *Neophocæna*, it should be used for the Finless-backed Porpoise, whose full name would thus be *Meomeris phocænoides*.

LXXXIV.—*The Bandicoots of Nuyts Archipelago, S. Australia, and of Cape York, N. Queensland.* By OLDFIELD THOMAS.

(Published by permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.)

PROF. F. WOOD JONES, of Adelaide, has sent to the British Museum two spirit-specimens and four picked-up skulls of the Bandicoot which inhabits the Nuyts Archipelago, where also he had previously obtained the interesting Murine *Leporillus jonesi*, described by me last year. In sending them, he has drawn my attention to certain characters in which they